

College of Science and Technology

Guidelines for Retention, Pre-Tenure Review, Promotion, Tenure, and Post-Tenure Review

Developed by the
Dean of the College of Science and Technology in consultation with
the College of Science and Technology Tenure and Promotion Committee
and the Faculty of the College of Science and Technology
Recommended to the Dean by the Faculty of the College of Science and Technology
May 12, 2014

Revised May 8, 2015, approved by vote of the CST Faculty

1. Introduction.....	3
2. General Procedures for Faculty Evaluation	4
2.1. Definitions and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, Service and Professional Development within the College of Science and Technology	4
2.1.1 Faculty Appointments.....	4
2.1.2. Definitions.....	4
2.2. Teaching.....	6
2.2.1. Scope and Definition of Teaching	6
2.2.2. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Retention, Pre-Tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review	6
2.2.3. Guidelines for Evaluation	7
2.2.3.1. Type of Load.....	7
2.2.3.2. Teaching and Testing methods.	7
2.2.3.3. Continuing attention to courses and teaching.	7
2.2.3.4. Relationship with students.	7
2.2.3.5. Currency in discipline and degree of preparation.	7
2.2.3.6. Definition of Teaching Excellence.	8
2.2.3.7. Documentation of Teaching Excellence.	8
2.2.4. Specific Evaluation Requirements	8
2.2.4.1. Self-evaluation.	8
2.2.4.2. Evaluation by students.	9
2.2.4.3. Evaluation by peers.	9
a.) Peer review of instruction for mentoring purposes.....	9
b.) Review of instruction for evaluative purposes	10
2.2.4.4. Evaluation by Department Head or Program Coordinator	11
2.2.4.5. Faculty Responsibilities.	11
2.3. Scholarship.....	11
2.3.1. The Scope and Definition of Scholarship	11
2.3.1.1 The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning	12
2.3.1.2 The Scholarship of Engagement	12
2.3.1.3 The Scholarship of Discovery.....	12
2.3.2. Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship	12
2.3.2.1. Documenting Scholarship.....	13
2.3.2.2. Evidences of Scholarship.....	14
2.4. Service.....	14
2.4.1. Service to the University.....	14
2.4.2. Service to the Profession.....	15
2.4.3. Service to the Community	15
2.4.4. Documenting Service.....	15
2.5. Professional Development	15
2.5.1 Documenting Professional Development	16
3. General Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure, Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review	16
3.1. College Promotion and Tenure Committee	17
3.1.1. Committee Members and Selection	17
3.1.2 Committee Terms.....	17

3.1.3. Committee Meetings	17
3.1.4. Committee Responsibilities and Duties	17
3.1.5. Chair of the Committee.....	18
3.1.6. Vote of the Committee.....	19
3.2. Procedure to Adopt College Guidelines	19
3.3. Procedure to Revise College Guidelines.....	19
3.4. Criteria, Application, and Notification	20
3.4.1. Departmental Criteria.....	20
3.4.2. Application.....	20
3.4.3. Notifications.....	21
3.4.4. Departmental Recommendations.....	22
3.4.5. College Committee Recommendations.....	22
3.4.6. Dean’s Recommendation.....	23
3.4.7. Deadlines.....	23
3.4.8. Appeals	23
3.4.9. Portfolio Contents	23
3.4.9.1. Retention	23
3.4.9.2 Pre-tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review	24

1. Introduction

Faculty evaluation for the purpose of retention, promotion and tenure occurs numerous times over the course of an academic career. For tenure-track faculty these evaluations, retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review, are among the most important decisions made at Armstrong State University. The future of the University and the College of Science and Technology is largely shaped and influenced by these decisions. The College of Science and Technology bases decisions regarding faculty retention, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion and post-tenure on the faculty member's demonstration of meeting high standards in teaching, scholarship, and service as well as continued professional growth and development throughout the entire evaluation period. It is recognized that the foundation of such decisions lies in the evaluative process.

The purpose of this document is to provide guidance to Departments within the College regarding the faculty evaluation process and the necessary requirements for a strong portfolio. Although some target expectations for performance are provided, it should be understood that there is flexibility in how faculty demonstrate their readiness for promotion and/or tenure. It should be understood that the burden of proof that a faculty member is ready for promotion and/or tenure rests with the candidate. Copies of departmental criteria and procedures shall be provided to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology and the College Committee on Tenure and Promotion. Departmental criteria are subject to review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs. The Board of Regents Policies and the Regulations of Armstrong State University govern these guidelines and take precedence in all matters of interpretation.

It is critical that each candidate for retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review be treated fairly and be measured against these guidelines and criteria objectively. Periodic discussions with the department head and dean should help clarify questions and help to prevent misconceptions. In addition, the peer review process is a required component of faculty evaluation prior to the award of tenure or promotion, and in retention, pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews. The peer review is an important piece of the faculty evaluation process as it provides additional clarity to the candidate regarding their performance. It is required that the department head conduct annual reviews and provide faculty members with written assessments of performance, including suggestions for improvements. Department heads should also meet annually with tenure-track faculty and faculty eligible for promotion to discuss the candidate's progress towards tenure and/or promotion. In these meetings the department head may consider recognizing accomplishments of the candidate that align with successful candidacies and also to identify areas of concern or warning signs. These meetings are advisory in nature and intended to assist in the development of the faculty member. *In all cases, for the evaluation of faculty retention, pre-tenure, tenure, promotion and post-tenure, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a portfolio of performance that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process.*

2. General Procedures for Faculty Evaluation

The College of Science and Technology procedures for Faculty Evaluation are based on the Board of Regents (BOR) Policy Manual of the University System of Georgia and the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook. Faculty should consult section 8.3.5 of the BOR Policy Manual entitled “Evaluation of Personnel” and section 105.2 of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook entitled “Faculty Evaluation” for guidelines related to faculty evaluation. Because greater specificity is desired under the institutional policies which govern faculty personnel matters, these Guidelines provide a more comprehensive basis for discerning the merits of a request for promotion or tenure. The Board of Regents Policies and the Regulations of Armstrong State University govern these guidelines and take precedence in all matters of interpretation.

Each tenure and promotion decision is made on a case-by-case basis. There may be occasions that a faculty member engages in activities that are vital to the ongoing operations of the university but are not explicitly listed in this document as teaching, scholarship, or service, or are otherwise beyond the call of duty for the normal faculty position. In those cases, faculty will work with their department head or program coordinator to decide how best to integrate those activities into their portfolio. These activities will be taken into account when assessing academic performance and making decisions about tenure and promotion.

2.1. Definitions and Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service within the College of Science and Technology

2.1.1 Faculty Appointments

There are three categories of full-time faculty members. Tenure-Track faculty include Assistant Professors, Associate Professors, and Professors. These faculty have professional obligations of teaching, scholarship, service and professional development. Lecturers and Senior Lecturers are instructional faculty who are not eligible for tenure. Their appointments include teaching, service and professional development obligations. Faculty appointed prior to the 2014-15 academic year who are non-tenure track may have been hired with an appointment as an Instructor. Employees who are hired as Limited Term Faculty have the title of Instructor.

2.1.2. Definitions

AFE – Annual Faculty Evaluation: The faculty evaluation completed each spring by the faculty member’s supervisor.

APARs – Annual Professional Activity Report: *This report, covering the activities of an entire calendar year (January-December), is completed by the faculty member and submitted directly to the department head/program coordinator at the end of the reporting period. A copy of this report must be attached as an appendix to the Annual*

Faculty Evaluation of the faculty member. (From Article II, Section A.2.a of the Faculty Handbook). The APAR should include all teaching, scholarship, and service, as well as professional development in each of the 3 areas only for the calendar year that the APAR covers. Candidates should clearly state whether papers have been submitted, accepted for publication or accepted for presentation. For example, if a paper is accepted in December of a year for a spring conference, the paper could be listed as accepted in the current year. Within the teaching section of the APAR, if a special topics course is taught then the topic name should be included in the course name section.

eFACE – Electronic Faculty and Course Evaluation – The name of the student evaluation system used by Armstrong State University (previously called FACE). eFACE is a form of summative evaluation (see below) of the faculty member by the student at the end of the course. eFACE results, when reflected upon and incorporated into the faculty member's teaching in subsequent semesters, becomes a form of formative evaluation (see below). SmartEvals are the replacement of eFACE starting Fall 2014.

Faculty Workload: The workload of the Armstrong State University faculty member will consist of activities related to teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. The semester credit hour is used as the measure for defining relative loads in these three areas, with the faculty workload understood as the *equivalent* of 15 semester hours of credit. Therefore faculty members who are assigned the equivalent of 15 semester hours of teaching will not be expected to be involved in an ongoing program of scholarship beyond what is necessary to support their teaching assignment nor will they be expected to have service responsibilities beyond advisement and routine committee work required to participate in their academic communities. See Faculty Workload in the ASU Faculty Handbook, section 107.6.2. and the College of Science and Technology Workload Policy. Faculty who are assigned lower teaching loads, such as 9-12 semester hours, are expected to maintain active responsibilities in the areas of scholarship and service to bring the *equivalent* workload to 15 semester hours.

Formative Evaluation: Formative evaluations are designed to improve a faculty member's overall teaching effectiveness and excellence during its development stage. This type of evaluation encompasses an ongoing review to provide valuable feedback to a faculty member to help him/her address weaknesses and identify and capitalize on strengths. It should happen early and often enough so that needed changes or modifications can be made in the early stages of one's career.

Professional Development: Professional development is a broad term that describes the process of growth that occurs over the academic lifetime of a faculty member. Faculty are expected to be life-long learners who strive to better their performance at increasingly higher levels in teaching, service, and scholarship.

Summative Evaluation: Summative evaluations are those data based evaluations (e.g. eFACE/SmartEvals, course surveys) that occur at the end of a time period (such as yearly, pre-tenure-review, tenure etc.) which are used to draw conclusions about a faculty member's performance over the time period.

The definitions for each faculty personnel action referred to in this document (i.e. retention of non-tenured faculty, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post tenure review) are defined in the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook, section 107.4.1.

2.2. Teaching

2.2.1. Scope and Definition of Teaching

Teaching effectiveness will be the most important factor in all evaluations. Teaching involves communicating knowledge, stimulating critical thinking, and fostering the intellectual curiosity essential for continuing the quest for knowledge. Tenure-track and tenured faculty are expected to be able to teach a broad range of courses within their discipline.

Excellence in teaching requires communication skills; the ability to interest and motivate students to strive for high standards; the maintenance of professional peer relationships; the ability to generate enthusiasm for learning; diversity sensitivity; ongoing professional development; and the flexibility to respond to individual student needs and learning styles. Students should be exposed to current scholarship in the field as appropriate. A teacher should provide thoughtful advice to students and to newer colleagues on academic matters. The excellent teacher evaluates students fairly and impartially and maintains a professional reputation among students and colleagues.

2.2.2. Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness for Retention, Pre-Tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion and Post-tenure Review

Possible indicators of teaching effectiveness include documentation of measured achievement of student learning outcomes within the faculty member's classes; the quality of course preparation and delivery of course materials, adherence to professional standards in classroom management, the use of literature driven innovative methodology and pedagogy, soundness and currency within the discipline, appropriateness of level and maintenance of standards. Documentation includes, but is not limited to, student and peer evaluations of instruction and could also include results from departmental or alumni surveys.

Criteria related to the evaluation of teaching effectiveness should take into consideration the mission of the particular department, the college, and the university. The criteria should allow and encourage diversity in instructional styles, methods, and creative approaches. The following guidelines offer general considerations for reviewing teaching effectiveness. Each department should use and interpret these categories in ways that best meet the department's teaching mission and goals. In general, evaluation should not only identify weaknesses but also give special attention to the strengths of each faculty member, noting particularly how the strengths contribute to the particular teaching needs of the department. Wherever possible, a distinction between formative

and summative evaluation should be taken into account. Teaching effectiveness is the most important consideration in promotion and tenure decisions.

2.2.3. Guidelines for Evaluation

2.2.3.1. Type of Load.

The College of Science and Technology serves three primary teaching missions within the university: 1) teaching parts of the Core Curriculum required of all students; 2) teaching various level courses for baccalaureate majors and for graduate programs; and 3) teaching support courses. Thus, faculty should teach an array of courses in their discipline or in fields related to their discipline and should be involved in majors and/or service courses that meet the needs and the mission of the department, the college and the university.

2.2.3.2. Teaching and Testing methods.

Basic faculty teaching responsibility involves being prepared for classes and meeting classes as scheduled, or as approved by the department head. In the education of its students, the College of Science and Technology particularly stresses the development of academic skills in critical thinking, problem solving, reading, writing, oral communication, and use of new technologies. Other skills may be distinct to particular disciplines or courses, e.g. lab sciences, engineering, computing disciplines, mathematics or psychology. In general, the methods of teaching, testing, and grading used by a particular faculty member should fit into a range deemed by the department which sponsors the course as appropriate to the discipline and to the level of instruction.

2.2.3.3. Continuing attention to courses and teaching.

Evidence of the continuing active engagement between the teacher and the discipline may include the development of new courses or revision of old courses, attention to the pedagogical conversation in the discipline and consequent use of new teaching materials or techniques, continuing assessment of the effectiveness of the resulting teaching and learning, or other means of integrating new material into courses.

2.2.3.4. Relationship with students.

This relationship includes being available to students for conferences and academic counseling, especially during office hours. It may also include supervision of individual student work such as independent study, directed readings, or student research. Perhaps most importantly, the relationship involves a genuine interest in teaching and working with students.

2.2.3.5. Currency in discipline and degree of preparation.

The disciplinary fields of study represented in the College of Science and Technology are always evolving. Thus, quality teaching requires continued active involvement in broadly defined disciplinary and professional activities. Examples of such activities include but are not limited to journal publications, review of publications, active participation in workshops, conference participation/chair or textbook reviews. In all cases, such activities serve to engage the faculty member in their discipline as the discipline advances and to assist the faculty member with their professional development as a scholarly teacher.

2.2.3.6. Definition of Teaching Excellence.

Teaching excellence is broadly defined as demonstrating superiority in the act of teaching. Teaching excellence requires the possession and command of discipline specific knowledge requisite for instruction and learning with a commitment to the learning process and academic rigor. Teaching excellence involves accurate and effective communication of material, central to the discipline, to students of varying degrees of background and preparation. Teaching excellence is evidenced by the ability to reach students at their level followed by the subsequent demonstration of an increase in student knowledge.

2.2.3.7. Documentation of Teaching Excellence.

Guidelines for assembling the teaching component of the portfolio are found in section 3.4.9

As noted previously, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a portfolio of performance that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. Demonstration of teaching excellence may include many different types of documentation. Examples of evidence which support excellence in teaching must include student evaluations, peer evaluations, department head evaluations, peer and department head review of teaching (classroom observation) for evaluation purposes, and evidence of self-improvement in the area of instruction. Evidence should be provided on how student, peer, and department head evaluations and feedback were used to improve teaching (i.e. formative evaluation). Additional evidences of teaching excellence may also include but not be limited to syllabi, samples of tests, exams, or other assignments, participation in peer mentoring activities, assessment of student learning outcomes and/or active participation in curriculum development. For more information on faculty responsibilities for documentation for various reviews see section 2.2.4 below.

2.2.4. Specific Evaluation Requirements

2.2.4.1. Self-evaluation.

A reflective, personal assessment of teaching experience in the form of a teaching analysis should be a part of a portfolio for retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review. This self-evaluation assessment should include how student,

peer, and department head evaluations and feedback were used to improve teaching during the evaluation period and may include examples of specific changes to instructional pedagogy in response to feedback and the assessed results. The self-evaluation assessment may also include illustrative documents, such as course syllabi, tests, or other material as appropriate. Other documentation that is recommended though not required include assessment results which measure student learning outcomes through the achievement of course outcomes. Examples to document this could include: pre/post tests and surveys, common/standardized departmental exams, a collaborative departmental review of exams and results from introductory courses in a department.

2.2.4.2. Evaluation by students.

Student evaluations play a role in the development of teaching. Surveys of student opinion also play a role in evaluation. The use of electronic Faculty and Course Evaluation (eFACE/SmartEvals) data and comments should note that in core courses and learning support courses, the faculty of the College of Science and Technology teach students who are primarily freshmen and sophomores taking required introductory level courses. The students in these courses are at the beginning of their university program and their skills and perceptions concerning university level work are not well developed. Students in upper level courses have acquired experience and mastery in university level skills and are pursuing an area of study that is of personal interest. Thus, student appraisal of faculty teaching performance should be discussed by the faculty member in their yearly APAR and in their portfolio and afforded a weight commensurate with the ability of the students to judge the issues surveyed. Student comments, surveys and eFACE/SmartEvals should never be the sole means of evaluating teaching.

2.2.4.3. Evaluation by peers.

Peer review of instruction has two primary uses: a) mentoring and b) evaluation. The methods of peer review and peer evaluation will vary according to department, however, each department is expected to develop a peer review and evaluation process. Copies of this departmental process shall be provided to the Dean of the College of Science and Technology and the College Committee on Promotion and Tenure. Departmental criteria are subject to review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

a.) Peer review of instruction for mentoring purposes¹:

Departments must take an active role in the mentoring and professional development of their faculty as quality teachers. Each department must establish specific guidelines for peer review for mentoring purposes that include formalized classroom observation by

¹ Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring and Peer Review of Instruction for Evaluation are required for tenure-track and permanent full-time faculty and at the discretion of the department head for temporary faculty

departmental peers and feedback to the faculty member. These guidelines must be approved by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean of the College. The department should use a partially standardized format/form developed and subsequently evaluated for effectiveness at least every three years, by the College Tenure and Promotion committee (available from the dean's office), to submit feedback from classroom teaching observations. Peer review of instruction should be both informal and frequent to allow for multiple sets of formative data to be collected. Peer-review for mentoring purposes should occur at least once each semester in a faculty member's first year, and at least once each year thereafter until tenure is achieved. The mentor, a tenured faculty member in the department other than the department head, must write up a written record of the mentoring review (using the standardized form) which may or may not be entered into the faculty member's official file at the option of the faculty member being reviewed. If there are no tenured faculty in the department to perform the peer mentoring reviews, a tenured faculty member in a closely related discipline, preferably in the College, may perform this duty for the faculty member until such time as a tenured faculty member becomes available. *Any faculty member, at any rank, may, at any time, request from their department head, a peer review for mentoring purposes.*

b.) Review of instruction for evaluative purposes¹:

Departments must take an active role in the mentoring and professional development of their faculty as quality teachers. *Each department should establish specific guidelines for review of instruction for evaluative purposes and these guidelines must be approved by the Tenure and Promotion Committee and the Dean of the College.* A review of instruction for evaluative purposes **differs** from a peer-review for mentoring purposes in that it is a formal evaluation of teaching by the peers and the department head that is based on portfolio contents (such as syllabi, course materials) and data (such as eFACE/SmartEvals), as well as formalized classroom observation by the department head (or program coordinator). The department head should use the partially standardized form from the dean's office to document the formal classroom observation. A review of instruction for evaluative purposes in this framework is governed by section 105.2 of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook. This evaluation is required at least once per year until tenure has been achieved and in every year in which a promotion is requested or a post-tenure review is required. However, in consultation with and agreement of the dean, the department head may limit the number of formal classroom observations for a particular candidate, to an alternate year cycle provided that outstanding classroom reviews at ASU have been documented. Review must occur in any year that there is a pre-tenure, tenure, promotion, or post-tenure action.

If a faculty member is hired with credit towards tenure then a review of instruction for evaluative purposes must occur in the faculty member's first semester.

¹ Peer Review of Instruction for Mentoring and Peer Review of Instruction for Evaluation is required for tenure-track and permanent full-time faculty and at the discretion of the department head for temporary faculty

Each of these reviews should culminate in a final statement of evaluation, placed into the portfolio, to which the instructor has an opportunity to respond.

2.2.4.4. Evaluation by Department Head or Program Coordinator (formative and summative evaluations)

Department head evaluations are an integral part of annual retentions, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review. The department head shall consider all submitted material and any other factual data relevant to the performance of teaching duties. As described previously, section 2.2.4.3.b., the department head also performs classroom visits and other assessments as necessary to complete his/her evaluation of the faculty member's teaching effectiveness.

2.2.4.5. Faculty Responsibilities.

Candidates for retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion and post-tenure review should refer to section 3.4.9, Portfolio Contents, for information regarding construction of the Portfolio. It is the responsibility of the faculty to submit all the requested documentation in an organized and timely fashion.

2.3. Scholarship

2.3.1. The Scope and Definition of Scholarship

Scholarship is an obligation of all **tenure-track and tenured** faculty in the College of Science and Technology in support of the university's mission. Scholarship is defined as a creative, intellectual work that is disseminated and professionally reviewed by peers in the discipline. In all categories of scholarship it is important to remember that not all activities engaged in by faculty are scholarship. An activity or project undertaken by a faculty member may be of importance but is not scholarship unless it contains the components found in all scholarship, which is a disciplined study producing new results which are subjected to peer review.

‘Scholarship’ may also be defined as any activity “of critical, systematic investigation in one or more fields and the submission of one’s findings for criticism by professional peers and the public through published writings, lectures, or other modes of presentation.” [\[1\]](#) The purpose of scholarship at Armstrong State University is to assure that the faculty is professionally active and that each faculty member has the knowledge and expertise not only to convey the work of others to students but to critically judge work in his/her field, engage in that work productively, and continue to develop intellectually. The Board of Regents provides the following definitions related to scholarship in the Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 4.7.2 Faculty Work in Schools.

2.3.1.1 The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning

Definition: The Scholarship of Teaching and Learning is the "systematic examination of issues about student learning and instructional conditions which promote the learning (i.e., building on previous scholarship and shared concerns), which is subjected to blind review by peers who represent the judgment of the profession, and, after review, is disseminated to the professional community[2]."

2.3.1.2 The Scholarship of Engagement

Definition: The Scholarship of Engagement in schools is characterized by the following[3]:

- It is to be conducted as an academic engagement with the public schools.
- It is to involve the responsible application of knowledge, theory and/or conceptual framework to consequential problems.
- It should test a research question or hypothesis.
- One must be able to use the results to improve practice and inform further questions.
- Resulting work should be available for dissemination for peer review of results.

2.3.1.3 The Scholarship of Discovery

Definition: The Scholarship of Discovery is basic research in the disciplines including the creative work of faculty. It is the "pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, a fierce determination to give free rein to fair and honest inquiry, wherever it may lead[3]." It contributes to the stock of human knowledge in the academic disciplines.

Scholarship is also understood as the integration and application of knowledge. This involves utilization, integration and synthesis of knowledge for the purposes of developing new ideas and interpretations based on the faculty member's expertise in the discipline. In addition, scholarship involves professional practice directly related to the individual's scholarly/creative specialization in support of the university's mission which relates to the community at large or the professional discipline. Scholarship is distinct from service in that it advances the boundaries of the faculty member's discipline.

2.3.2. Criteria for Evaluation of Scholarship

The evaluation of scholarship should be based not only on the magnitude of the achievement but also should consider the impact the achievement has on the mission of the university.

Departments within the College of Science and Technology are responsible for establishing criteria and procedures to be used in the annual evaluation of the scholarly activities and achievements of their members. Departmental criteria are subject to review and approval by the Dean of the College and the Provost and Vice President of Academic

Affairs and by the College Tenure and Promotion Committee. Departmental criteria and procedures should be reviewed at least every five years by the respective department. Departments are responsible for informing their members of the criteria and procedures to be used by the Department in the annual evaluation of scholarship.

Scholarly evaluation criteria should address types of scholarly activity within the Department that will count, the relative weight (expressed qualitatively) for different activities, and acceptable levels of activity. The criteria should provide the basis for making qualitative as well as quantitative judgments of scholarly activities. At a minimum, to be included in scholarship, there must be some demonstrable product or outcome and the work must involve a scholarly contribution based on the faculty member's professional knowledge and expertise and be subjected to peer review. These established criteria should strongly support the defined mission of the Department while being consistent with University Regulations and the definition of scholarly activities and achievements adopted by the College of Science and Technology.

In general, the weight of scholarship completed prior to employment at ASU will be determined by Departments. Collaborations, especially involving undergraduates and interdisciplinary interactions are strongly encouraged. However, it is recommended that the faculty consult with their department regarding the department's perspective on the value placed on collaborative work vs. work performed by a single author. Faculty should give an assessment in their portfolio of their overall contribution to the collaborative efforts (i.e. team leader, principal investigator, data analysis, background research, leading student group etc.)

2.3.2.1. Documenting Scholarship

Guidelines for assembling the scholarship component of the portfolio are found in section 3.4.9. It is the responsibility of the faculty member to provide copies of work or supporting documentation as required.

As noted previously, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a portfolio of performance that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. Scholarship should appear in a faculty member's APAR in an appropriate year. It is acceptable to indicate that a work has been submitted in the year it was submitted. It is acceptable to indicate a work that was published in the year it was published. It would not be appropriate to indicate that a work has been published or a talk presented when that work is to occur in the next APAR calendar year. Documenting a scholarly work should include appropriate citation information and could also include:

- a) information about the peer review process involved in the selection of the scholarly product.
- b) acceptance rates for conferences, journals, workshops, etc.
- c) funding rate in a grants competition.

- d) the strength of journal or conference as indexed in a scholarly publication database such as Web of Science could also be included when available.
- e) Number of citations of the published work by others in the field, if applicable

These are suggestions for additional information that could be included regarding a scholarly work; they are not requirements. The intent is for faculty to document their work in such a way that they provide as much information as possible to the evaluators to provide a more complete picture of the scholarly impact of the work. The overarching theme of professional development in scholarship should also be addressed by the candidate. Candidates should reflect on how their role in scholarship has changed over the evaluation period to show increasing development of the faculty member (in publication number or status, grant numbers, amount, status, recognition and awards etc.) as a scholar in their discipline. By documenting annual scholarly activities appropriately in the annual APAR, information can more easily be assembled in later portfolios for pre-tenure review, tenure, or promotion matters.

2.3.2.2. Evidences of Scholarship

There are many different types of scholarship and the College does not prescribe a scholarly requirement that ensures successful review. For additional guidance in this matter, faculty are encouraged to reference their departmental retention, promotion, and tenure guidelines and to consult with their department head.

2.4. Service

Service includes all work that involves the use of a faculty member's academic status or professional expertise to benefit the university, college, department, community or profession. Unless otherwise stipulated, service is considered a responsibility of employment and consequently subject to evaluation. Each department head should communicate clearly to each faculty member the importance of service and the various types of service in the evaluation process and provide guidelines for appropriate forms of service.

Each faculty member's Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR) will include an appropriate description of all service activities engaged in during the evaluation period in question.

2.4.1. Service to the University

Service to the university may include, but is not limited to, contributions to special departmental, college, or university projects; working with students or faculty on extracurricular activities; active membership on department, college, or university committees; and participation in the public service, continuing education, or recruitment programs of the department and the university. Examples of additional such activities

would include (but are not limited to) serving as a department head, program director or coordinator, or leading comprehensive task forces such as SACS accreditation.

2.4.2. Service to the Profession

Service to the profession can be demonstrated in a variety of ways. Such service often arises through membership in and participation in projects of local, regional, national or international professional organizations.

2.4.3. Service to the Community

Service to the community may vary in importance from department to department. Evidence of service to the community may include, but need not be limited to, service to public agencies; service to the K-12 educational sector with particular attention given to improvement of teacher quality and student learning, professional consultation; public speeches reflecting the discipline and profession of a faculty member or reflecting the results of scholarship; cultural or artistic contributions; and involvement and participation in civic organizations, charitable projects and community service. In all cases, however, linkages to the faculty member's professional role within the university must be evident.

2.4.4. Documenting Service

Guidelines for assembling the service component of the portfolio are found in section 3.4.9

As noted previously, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a portfolio of performance that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. When describing service activities in the annual APAR and also when preparing portfolio materials for retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review it is important that the actual service activities/actions be denoted. It would be useful in the review process to know the role of a faculty member while serving on a committee rather than to see just a list of committee assignments. It is expected that candidates show a progression of service responsibilities that indicates professional development and growth in service activity, duties and leadership.

2.5. Professional Development

Professional development may be defined as activities that impact a faculty member's knowledge or skills, leading to improved teaching, enhanced scholarly work or improving the effectiveness of their service contributions. Professional development may include many different types of activities, such as participation at conferences, workshops, or institutes; on-campus programming delivered by the Faculty Development Office; or self-directed efforts.

2.5.1 Documenting Professional Development

It is important for the faculty member to demonstrate professional growth. Guidelines for including professional development activities are found in section 3.4.9 Guidelines for assembling the service component of the portfolio are found in section 3.4.9

As noted previously, it is the responsibility of the faculty member to assemble a portfolio of performance that is persuasive to all parties involved in the evaluation process. When describing professional development in the annual APAR and also when preparing portfolio materials for retention, pre-tenure review, tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review it is important that activities/actions be denoted and described in a manner that show a progression of professional development in all evaluation areas (teaching, service and scholarship).

3. General Procedures for Retention, Promotion and Tenure, Pre-Tenure and Post-Tenure Review

The College of Science and Technology procedures for Promotion and Tenure are based on the Board of Regents (BOR) Policy Manual of the University System of Georgia and the Armstrong State University faculty handbook. Candidates should consult sections 105 and 107.2 of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook.

The BOR has set the following minimum criteria for promotion and for tenure that must be met by all institutions. These minimum criteria, including specific degree requirements and time in service, vary across institutional sectors (see BOR policy 8.3.6, Criteria for Promotion which reads: “The minimum criteria are: 1. Superior teaching, 2. Outstanding professional service to the institution, and/or the community, 3. Outstanding research, scholarship, creative activity or academic achievement, 4. Professional growth and development (BOR Minutes, October 2008). Noteworthy achievement in all four of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two (8.3.7, Tenure and Criteria for Tenure). Candidates should consult sections 107.4 and 107.4.4 of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook for more detailed information on meeting the university requirements of accomplishment in teaching, scholarship, service, and professional development. In particular, a candidate for tenure must not only meet the designated minimum period of service and terminal degree requirements, but also must meet what are, at that time, seen as the long range needs of the university and must show a history of evaluations that merits the award of tenure. In addition, at the time of the initial campus interview, any candidate who seeks probationary credit toward tenure from previous experience must have that experience certified in writing by the vice president and dean of faculty and by the department head/program director. Similarly, any credit for related experience in the candidate's teaching field must also be certified by the provost and vice president and dean of faculty and the department head/program director. (see section 107.4.1 of the Armstrong State University Faculty Handbook)

Because greater specificity is desired under the institutional policies which govern faculty personnel matters, these Guidelines of the College of Science and Technology, provide a more comprehensive basis for discerning the merits of a request for promotion or tenure. The Board of Regents Policies and the Regulations of Armstrong State University govern these guidelines and take precedence in all matters of interpretation.

3.1. College Promotion and Tenure Committee

3.1.1. Committee Members and Selection

The College Promotion and Tenure Committee will consist of one tenured full-time faculty member from each department selected by vote of the full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty of the department. In the situation where a department does not have any full-time tenured faculty, the departmental representative will be appointed by the dean in consultation with the department head. A department head shall not serve on the committee unless he/she is the only tenured faculty member in the department. A candidate for promotion or tenure or their family member may not serve in that year. If a department's elected representative is not eligible to serve for one of these reasons, then a special election is held within the department following the same guidelines as described above. The person selected in the special election will serve for a one year term. If the original representative was in the middle of an elected term, their remaining original term will continue the following year.

In the case where all committee members are new, the dean will appoint a previous committee member to serve in a non-voting capacity.

3.1.2 Committee Terms

Each member will serve a three-year term and no more than two consecutive terms. Any ineligible years will be included as part of the three year term. If, for example, a committee member is not eligible in their second year, they will still have one year remaining. If there is a dean's appointment, the appointment is for one year.

3.1.3. Committee Meetings

The Committee will establish a meeting schedule for the fall semester to ensure that all promotion and tenure portfolios are evaluated and written recommendations are made to the dean according to the timeline established for that year by the Dean of the College.

The Committee will establish a meeting schedule for the spring semester to ensure that all third year and post-tenure review portfolios are evaluated and written recommendations are made to the dean according to the time line established for that year by the Dean of the College.

3.1.4. Committee Responsibilities and Duties

- The committee will review materials defining departmental criteria for tenure and promotion as well as third year and post-tenure review.
- The committee will consistently apply, in a fair and professional manner, the appropriate Departmental and College Guidelines to all portfolios submitted for the Committee's review and evaluation. The committee serves to ensure the consistent application of these Guidelines across the departments of the College and to monitor procedural matters.
- Each committee member will evaluate each portfolio submitted for promotion, tenure, pre-tenure review or post-tenure. The full committee will then meet to discuss each portfolio. A complete complement of all committee members is required for all discussions, meetings, and recommendations regarding portfolios.
- The committee may, when appropriate, recommend revisions of "The Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure of the College of Science and Technology" to the dean.
- The committee will conduct its business in accordance with the time line established for that year by the Dean of the College. The committee will conduct its review of portfolios, voting, and prepare its written recommendations with promotion and tenure cases reviewed in the fall semester and pre- and post-tenure review cases reviewed in the spring.
- Other duties as assigned by the dean, such as review of forms, policies, and/or guidelines, etc.

3.1.5. Chair of the Committee

The Committee will elect one of its members to serve as the Chair of the committee who will serve for a term of one academic year. The chair may be re-elected for a second one-year term.

The chair will be responsible for:

- Receipt of application materials for tenure, promotion, pre-tenure and post-tenure reviews from the dean;
- Distribution of application materials for tenure and promotion and pre-tenure review;
- Smooth transition of committees from year to year;
- Scheduling and overseeing meetings of the committee;

- Maintenance of accurate records of all proceedings;
- Relaying the recommendations of the committee to the dean in writing.
- Convening the Committee, as necessary, to discuss and act on recommended revisions to the Promotion and Tenure Guidelines of the College.

3.1.6. Vote of the Committee

- Votes are by secret ballot
- The vote along with comments will be included in the recommendation of the committee.
- The dean should consult with the committee regarding their recommendation prior to informing the candidate
- The dean shall notify the department head and candidate of the vote and recommendations of the committee.

3.2. Procedure to Adopt College Guidelines

- The Guidelines will be distributed at least two weeks prior to voting. The Guidelines will clearly indicate the current wording and the proposed changes.
- The faculty will make a recommendation to the dean to accept or reject the Guidelines by a simple majority vote of the faculty who cast a vote.
- All tenured and tenure-track College of Science and Technology faculty are eligible to vote.
- This vote shall be done via secret ballot
- Guidelines approved by the dean are sent to the Provost and of Academic Affairs for official approval.

3.3. Procedure to Revise College Guidelines

- Revisions to the Guidelines may be recommended by the College tenured and tenure-track faculty to the Committee.
- The Committee will discuss proposed revisions and determine by a simple majority vote whether to accept or reject each revision.

- The committee will then provide a copy of the Guidelines that highlight each approved revision to the full College faculty for discussion. After at least two weeks for consideration, the faculty will make a recommendation to the dean to accept or reject each proposed revision by a simple majority vote.
- All tenured and tenure-track College faculty are eligible to vote.
- This vote shall be done via secret ballot
- Revisions will be effective upon acceptance by the dean and approval by the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs and implemented at the start of the next academic year.

3.4. Criteria, Application, and Notification

3.4.1. Departmental Criteria.

Each department will develop criteria, especially in the interpretation of service, scholarship, and teaching, as well as specific guidelines on application procedures, for promotion and tenure. These criteria guidelines will be received by both the Dean of the College and the College Committee on Tenure and Promotion prior to implementation and will be available to faculty. Criteria must address the evaluation of scholarship, service, and teaching outlined above. Departmental criteria must be approved by the college dean prior to their use.

3.4.2. Application.

A faculty member seeking **promotion or tenure** who believes that he/she has met all criteria of the department, the College of Science and Technology, and the university as they appear in the Faculty Handbook, should meet with the department head to discuss the application. Candidates may apply for a particular promotion or tenure during the academic year in which they will complete the minimum time requirement. Tenure may be awarded, upon approval of the president, upon completion of a probationary period of at least five (5) years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher (BOR Minutes, August 2007). All untenured tenure-track faculty members in the sixth year of service must be reviewed for tenure. In the case of suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the faculty member needs to get permission from the president per BOR guidelines (BOR policy Manual 8.3.7.4). A faculty member not awarded tenure during the final year review will be offered a contract for a final year, subject to the BOR guidelines. For specific timelines and terminal degree requirements, see section 107.4.1 of the Armstrong State University Handbook.

Faculty holding the rank of lecturer will be reviewed yearly for retention by departmental retention procedures that include both faculty committees and Department Heads until such time as they are promoted to Senior Lecturer at or after the sixth year of service.

Once a faculty member is promoted, yearly retentions will be performed only by Department Heads. Full review (faculty committee, Department Head and Tenure and Promotion Committee) will only occur during the fifth year after the year in which promotion to Senior Lecturer is awarded and every five years thereafter.

For the purposes of reappointment of lecturers after six consecutive years and for promotion to senior lecturer, exceptional teaching and extraordinary value to the institution will be demonstrated by effective teaching and the fulfillment of the requirements specified by the department. As described in 2.2.2 of this document, possible indicators of teaching effectiveness include documentation of measured achievement of student learning outcomes within the faculty member's classes, the quality of course preparation and delivery of course materials, adherence to professional standards in classroom management, the use of literature driven innovative methodology and pedagogy, soundness and currency within the discipline, appropriateness of level and maintenance of standards. Documentation includes, but is not limited to, student and peer evaluations of instruction and could also include results from departmental or alumni surveys.

All faculty, excluding those who hold administrative rank at the department head/program director level or above (those holding administrative rank are evaluated through administrative rather than post-tenure review), will be reviewed under the Procedures Relating to Post-Tenure Review (section 107.4.3, ASU Faculty Handbook) during the fifth year after the year in which tenure is awarded by the President and every five years thereafter. If a faculty member is promoted in rank during the five year period, the post-tenure review will occur during the fifth year after the year in which the promotion becomes effective. A successful promotion review will serve in lieu of a post-tenure review.

The details of the application procedure for tenure or promotion and the departmental review process may vary with the department. The application process will provide the candidate the opportunity to document that the granting of tenure or a particular promotion is appropriate. All materials prepared by the candidate and all recommendations in the process must be communicated to the next level of review.

3.4.3. Notifications

The department head will remind the candidate of when the portfolio is due to the department and notify the candidate when the materials have been delivered to the dean's level. The dean shall notify the department head and candidate of the vote and recommendations of the committee. This notification shall be in writing by an official memo.

For promotion and tenure evaluations, the candidate will be informed of the results at the conclusion of the university review process. For post-tenure review, the candidate will be informed of the results at the conclusion of the college review process.

3.4.4. Departmental Recommendations.

The departmental recommendation consists of two components. The faculty of the department or a designated subcommittee of the faculty makes a recommendation to the department head, and subsequently the department head responds to the faculty recommendation with a recommendation of his or her own. The department head's recommendation, the recommendation of the faculty, and the candidate's application materials are forwarded to the dean.

Important Notes:

- Eligibility to vote on departmental recommendations for promotion and tenure is determined as follows:

Retention: All tenured and tenure-track faculty senior to the candidate in the department are eligible to cast ballots.

Pre-tenure Review: All tenured faculty senior to the candidate in the department are eligible to cast ballots. The department head may solicit input from ineligible tenure-track faculty

Tenure: All tenured faculty in the department are eligible to cast ballots.

Promotion: (1) Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty: All faculty within the department who have rank higher than the candidate are eligible to vote. (2) Promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer: All tenured faculty and Senior Lecturers in the department are eligible to vote.

Post-tenure review: All full time tenured faculty within the department are eligible to vote.

- Under no circumstances should the departmental faculty committee designated to make recommendations to the department head have fewer than three members. If there are not enough qualified faculty members within the department to constitute the review committee, the department head will work with the Dean of the College of Science and Technology and the faculty member to appoint qualified colleagues from other departments at ASU or solicit external evaluation of the portfolio by disciplinary colleagues at institutions similar to ASU.

3.4.5. College Committee Recommendations.

The dean will forward these application materials to the chair of the college's Committee on Tenure and Promotion. The materials, along with the recommendation of the committee, will be returned to the dean.

3.4.6. Dean's Recommendation.

The dean will forward his/her recommendation along with that of the college committee and other accumulated materials to the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs.

3.4.7. Deadlines.

The following deadlines for both promotion and tenure will apply.

Application to Department Head	2 nd Friday after Labor Day
Department Head to Dean	2 nd Friday in October
Promotion and Tenure Committee to Dean	2 nd Friday in December

The following deadlines for post-tenure and third year review will apply.

Application to Department Head	last Friday in January
Department Head to Dean	3 rd Friday in February
Promotion and Tenure Committee to Dean	2 nd Friday in March

The deadline will shift to the next business day when it falls on a University holiday.

In the case of an approved suspended tenure process, due dates for the affected faculty member will be established by the Dean of the College of Science and Technology in consultation with the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs keeping in mind the amount of time for which the faculty has been absent.

3.4.8. Appeals

Candidates whose candidacies are rejected may appeal through the appropriate procedures of the University and University System. A formal appeal begins with a letter to the Provost detailing why a different decision should have been made followed by any supporting materials not already submitted for consideration.

3.4.9. Portfolio Contents

Faculty should save their copies of these items each year for their portfolio assembly. Some of these items may be obtained from Institutional Research or the Department Head.

3.4.9.1. Retention

- 1.) A complete, up-to-date *Curriculum Vitae*

- 2.) Yearly summary of student evaluations (eFACE/SmartEvals)
- 3.) Copies of Annual Faculty Evaluations (AFEs) since hiring (or past five years for those employed longer than five years at ASU) including the most recently completed calendar year.
- 4.) Annual Professional Activity Reports (APARs) since hiring (or past five years for those employed five or more years at Armstrong) including the most recently completed calendar year.
- 5.) All reports documenting peer review of instruction for evaluative purposes
- 6.) Copies of scholarship produced by the candidate
- 7.) A reflective self-evaluation/teaching analysis that responds to the student input and past peer review since hiring (or past five years for those employed longer than five years at ASU).

In addition, the following could be included if requested by the Department or deemed relevant by the candidate:

1. Student surveys
2. Alumni surveys
3. Syllabi, tests and exams,
4. Other course handouts and materials,
5. Grade distributions for courses
6. Additional material that the instructor deems useful

3.4.9.2 Pre-tenure Review, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review:

Portfolios shall be divided into two folders split according to the guidelines below:

Master Portfolio: (all are required)

1. A letter requesting the particular review, either, promotion and/or tenure, and a brief outline of the documentation that the requirements have been met.
2. A Table of Contents of the documentation being submitted (for both portfolios).
3. A complete, up-to-date *Curriculum Vitae* including all information needed for the Promotion/Retention Recommendation Form and a record of teaching, service, scholarship and faculty development activities.
4. Copies of the Annual Faculty Evaluation (AFE), the Annual Professional Activities Report (APAR), eFACE/SmartEvals annual statistical summaries, and Smart Evals Custom Reports for each course taught each semester since hiring (or last 5 years once tenured) including the most recently completed calendar year. For post-tenure review the AFE is optional for the fifth year of the review period.
5. All reports documenting peer-review of teaching for evaluative purposes. Faculty may include their responses.

6. A reflective self-evaluation/**teaching** analysis that addresses and responds to student input, past peer review and evaluation, and past department head evaluations.
7. A reflective self-evaluation/scholarship analysis that addresses the **scholarship** program of the candidate while at Armstrong including past, current, and any future plans. This self-evaluation must address any comments in the area of scholarship in previous evaluations.
8. A reflective self-evaluation/service analysis that addresses the **service** efforts of the candidate at the departmental, college, university, state, national, and international levels. This self-evaluation must address any comments in the area of service in previous evaluations.
9. A reflective self-evaluation of faculty development activities that describes how these activities have enhanced the professional development of the candidate.
10. For tenure cases a copy of the candidate's pre-tenure review and the candidate's response thereto.
11. Report on departmental vote and Department head recommendation (added by Department Head after submittal and before forwarding to the College Tenure and Promotion Committee).

Supplementary Portfolio

Required:

1. Copies of all eFACE/SmartEvals documents covering the review period (last five years if after tenure).
2. Copies of scholarship produced by the candidate.
3. A representative sample of teaching materials, including syllabi, course materials, tests and exams, and any other course handouts and materials. Do not duplicate materials. Include materials to show developments in teaching, if applicable.
4. Documentation of formal faculty development activities in which the candidate has participated.
5. Other materials as required by Departmental guidelines.

Suggested items (not required)

1. Faculty may choose to add copies of other peer review (peer-review for mentoring purposes or peer review by faculty request) at their own discretion.
2. Student surveys
3. Alumni Surveys
4. Documentation of Scholarship metrics including: grant funding rates; manuscript acceptance rates; impact factors; number of citations
5. Any additional documentation of performance in teaching, service, and scholarship over the evaluation period.
6. Grade distributions
7. Any additional material that the instructor deems useful may be included.

References:

- [1] Eric J. Ziolkowski, "Slouching Toward Scholardom: The Endangered American College," *College English*, 58, 5 (September 1996), 569.
- [2] Research Universities Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. *Policies and Procedures Supporting the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in the Research University* (Draft). Carnegie Consortium for the Advancement of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning, 2005.
- [3] Glassick, C.E., M.T.Huber, and G.I. Maeroff. *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.